REMARKS

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116, because the amendments place the application in condition for allowance and do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented, because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 4-9 were pending in this application when examined.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "X represents a charge-transporting group, which is a hole-transporting group consisting of an anthracene group, or an electron transporting group consisting of a naphthalenediimide group or a phenyldiimide group. Support for these amendments can be found on page 6, lines 2-6 and page 12, lines 16-25 of the specification.

Claim 1 has also been amended to recite that "Y represents a light-emitting group consisting of oxadiazolopyridine derivatives" from claim 4, the result of which claim 4 has been cancelled.

Claims 5-8 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. 2004/0219387) in view of Ishii et al; rejects claims 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. in view of Ishii et al. and Tashiro et al. (U.S. 5,059,863); rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. in view of Ishii et al. and Mataga et al. (JP 2003-133072); rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. in view of Ishii et al. and Tashiro et al. (JP 2000-282024); rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. in view of Ishii et al. and Ishida et al. (JP 2003-157977); and rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. in view of Ishii et al. and Nakatsuka et al. (JP 2003-151778).

As applied to the amended claims, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 1 is directed to an organic EL device comprising an emission layer containing an organic EL dye formed by linking a light-emitting group Y represented by the formula $(Y\text{-}L)_nX_m$ to a charge-transporting group X, wherein X represents a charge-transporting group, which is **a hole-transporting group consisting of an anthracene group,** or **an electron transporting group consisting of a naphthalenediimide group or a phenyldiimide group**, and **Y represents a light-emitting group consisting of oxadiazolopyridine derivatives**.

Li et al. disclose a compound of formula (vi) for a luminescent layer of an OLED comprising pyrene as a host moiety, a stilbenyl group as a guest moiety and $-O\text{-}CH_2\text{-}CH_2\text{-}O-$ as a linking moiety (see paragraphs [0031]-[0033], [0040], [0041] and page 5).

However, the reference does not teach or suggest the combination of **oxadiazolopyridine derivatives**, and **a hole-transporting group consisting of an anthracene group or an electron-transporting group consisting of a naphthalenediimide group or a phenyldiimide group**, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 would not have been obvious over the Li et al. reference.

Ishii et al., Tashiro et al. (U.S. 5,059,863), Mataga et al., Tashiro et al. (JP 2000-282024), Ishida et al. and Nakatsuka et al. also do not teach or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 would not have been obvious over Li et al. in view of any of these additional references.

The Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the light emitting compound disclosed in Tashiro et al. (U.S. 5,059,863) with the compound in the organic EL device disclosed by Li et al., in view of Ishii et al. However, none of these references disclose or suggest that a single-layer organic EL device which can emit light at a low voltage equivalent to or at a lower voltage than that in a device of a multi-layer structure, as in the presently claimed invention (see page 32, lines 6-20 of the specification).

As shown in Tables 1 and 2 of the specification, the single-layer organic EL device of the present application initiated light emission at a low voltage of 3-5 V, and it had a illuminance of 1000 cd/cm^2 at an applied voltage of 9 V (see pages 32-33 of the specification).

Accordingly, the claimed invention provides unexpected results over the prior art.

Li only discloses a multi-layer EL device and does not disclose an example of a single-layer EL device (see paragraph [0055]).

Tashiro et al. only disclose data for the illuminance of a multi-layer EL device, and that the driving voltage is between 14-16 V (see Tables 1-3 of the reference).

Ishii et al. do not disclose illuminance at al.

Accordingly, the unexpected results of the presently claimed invention would not have been obvious over the references.

In view of the foregoing, claim 1 would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Claim 9 depends from claim 1, and thus also would not have been obvious over the references.

II. Conclusion

For these reasons, Applicant takes the position that the presently claimed invention is clearly patentable over the applied references.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the rejections set forth by the Examiner have been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Shinichiro ISOBE

By /Andrew B. Freistein/ Digitally signed by /Andrew B. Freistein/ DN: cn=/Andrew B. Freistein/, o=WLP, ou=WLP, email=afreistein@wenderoth.com, c=US Date: 2010.03.31 14:44:23 -04'00'

Andrew B. Freistein
Registration No. 52,917
Attorney for Applicant

ABF/emj
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 31, 2010